

REMARKS

Claims 18, 20-29 and 31-34 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 18, 25, 26 and 29 are amended for clarity only, e.g., to obviate the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 27, 29 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Holmes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,756,457). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 is directed to a dishwashing machine comprising, *inter alia*, a washing container and a dosing device. The dosing device is operatively connected to an arrangement that separately stores the basic chemical products of an all-round additive product independent of one another. The dosing device is operable to independently add into the dishwasher:

- 1) at least a portion of a selected one of at least one basic chemical product of the all-round additive product not used for clear rinsing;
- 2) at least two, but not all, of the basic chemical products of the all-round additive product together, and
- 3) at least one reaction mixture including the basic chemical products of the all-round additive product.

These “modes” have been delineated in claim 18 (and 29) using reference numbers 1-3, for clarity purposes.

Holmes et al. does not teach or suggest this subject matter. In particular, Holmes et al. does not teach a dosing device that is operable to independently add into the dishwasher the three types of doses specified in claim 18. In Holmes et al., a dishwashing machine is coupled to a mixer block 14 via a charge line 37. Mixer block 14 includes two venturies 15 and 16 which are coupled to respective containers 12 and 13 via tubes 30 and 31. Containers 12 and 13 include two dishwashing additives in liquid form.

In operation, water from a water line 17 connected to a main 18 is introduced into venturies 15 and 16, which by vacuum pressure applies suction to tubes 30 and 31 to aspirate liquid from containers 12 and 13, respectively. The combined mixture of water and the dishwashing additives from barrels 12 and 13 is delivered to the dishwashing machine 11 via charge line 37.

In the event that either one of the liquid additives is depleted sufficiently so that the level falls below the inlet port of its associated aspirator tube, the supply of both additives is automatically cut off. Column 3, lines 9-14. In particular, if the liquid additive in container 13 falls below the elevation of intake port 33 so that the aspirator tube 31 is no longer immersed in the liquid additive, the vacuum of the throat 22 (Figure 2) of venturi 16 is destroyed. Because the throats 22 of each of the venturies 15 and 16 are in communication, by virtue of the conduit 26, the vacuum of the throat of the venturi 15 is also destroyed and the aspiration of the additive from the other container 12 automatically ceases. Thus, wasteful supply of a single additive to the container 12 to the dishwashing machine 11 cannot occur. However, the delivery of the uncharged water to the dishwasher 11 can continue immediately following additive cutoff. See column 3, lines 15-35.

Accordingly, Holmes et al. operates in one of two modes. The first mode includes delivery of the combination of water and the additives from barrels 12 and 13. The second mode includes delivery of water only.

As such, Holmes et al. does not teach or suggest that the dosing device is operable to independently add into the dishwasher three types of doses specified in claim 18. Namely, Holmes et al. does not teach that its dosing device can dispense at least a portion of a selected one of at least one basic chemical product of the all-round additive product not used for clear rinsing. In the first mode of Holmes et al., water together with the chemical products from barrels 12 and 13 is introduced, and thus this does not qualify as “at least a portion of a selected one of at least one basic chemical product of the all-round additive product”. In the second Holmes et al. mode, where only water is introduced, this

does not qualify to satisfy mode 1 of claim 18 since the water-only mode is used for clear rinsing.

Holmes et al. also does not teach that at least two but not all of the basic chemical products of the all around additive product together are introduced into the dishwasher, i.e., mode 2 of claim 18. The only mode in which Holmes et al. introduces at least two of the basic chemical products includes all of the chemical products. Finally, Holmes et al. does not teach or suggest that its dosing device is operable to independently add into the dishwasher at least one reaction mixture including the basic chemical products of the all-round additive product. There is no teaching or suggestion that Holmes et al. deals with a reaction mixture.

Similar comments apply to analog method claim 29. In particular, Holmes et al. does not teach or suggest a step of dosing an additive product into the dishwashing machine including dosing, from an arrangement that separately stores the basic chemical products of an all-round additive product independent of one another, 1) at least a portion of a selected one of at least one basic chemical product of the all-round additive product not used for clear rinsing, 2) at least two, but not all, of the basic chemical products of the all-round additive product together, and 3) at least one reaction mixture consisting of the basic chemical products of the all-round additive product.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Holmes et al. Further, claims 21, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Holmes et al. in view of Graf (U.S. Patent No. 4,188,807). Further, claims 25 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Holmes et al. in view of Bashark (U.S. Patent No. 3,888,269). In addition, claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Holmes et al. in view of McNabb et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0117511). These rejections are respectfully traversed at least because these claims depend from independent claims 18 or 27, and are patentable by virtue of the dependency, in addition to the further features they recite.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the present Amendment. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

/James E. Howard/

James E. Howard

Registration No. 39,715

August 24, 2009

BSH Home Appliances Corporation
100 Bosch Blvd.
New Bern, NC 28562
Phone: 252-639-7644
Fax: 714-845-2807
james.howard@bshg.com